IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No.33803-M of 2006

DATE OF DECISION:15.02.2007

Pritam Singh @ Preet .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & Anr. .....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present:- Shri VB Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Shri N.S. Gill, AAG, Punjab.

****

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuing directions to the respondents for registration of a criminal case against accused persons mentioned in the petition.

I have heard counsel for the parties.

Earlier the petitioner has filed a similar petition i.e. Crl. Misc. No. 3365-M of 2005, which was disposed of on 17.1.2005 with a direction to the petitioner to make a fresh representation before SSP, Amritsar, who will look into the same.

In the reply filed on behalf of respondent-State, it has been stated that on the basis of the said directions, a representation made by the petitioner was got inquired and the allegations levelled by him were found to be false. The inquiry conducted by the Investigating Officer was also approved by the SSP, Amritsar.

In view of the aforesaid facts, I am not inclined to exercise the inherent power of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuing directions for registration of a criminal case, as in my opinion, the petitioner has alternative remedy, as has been held by this Court in **Mithlesh Kumari** Vs. **State of Punjab**, 2002 (4) RCR (Criminal) 541 and

by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gangadhar Janardan Mhatre** Vs. **State of Maharashtra and others**, (2004) 7 SCC 768 and **Minu Kumari and another** Vs. **State of Bihar and others**, (2006) 4 Supreme Court Cases 359.

Dismissed.

However, it will be open for the petitioner to avail his alternative remedy of filing a private complaint.

February 15, 2007 **(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)**
pooja **JUDGE**